

In The United States District Court  
For The Western District of Pennsylvania.

COREY HARRIS, PRO SE

VS. Plaintiff

Domestic Relations, Section, et al, Defendants,  
magistrate Judge Baxter

C.A. NO. 04-369-E

: District Judge Cahill

Defendants,

MOTION OF OBJECTION

Pursuant to Federal R, Civil, R,

1) Plaintiff motion the Court to reconsider M.J.  
R&R base on the following in Support As follow:

A) The Court R & R which was supported by  
the defendants doctrine of the Rooker-  
Feldman doctrine.

B) The defendants doctrine has A Criminal  
Sub-Section Code of crimes, Plaintiff Case does not.  
for the Court to Support the States doctrine.  
Under the kind from which the doctrine acquired  
its Name, from cases of criminal cases brought  
by State Court losers Complaining of injuries  
Caused by State -Court Judgments.

Plaintiff states the Court R & R Should be  
Reconsider or denied by the Court do to  
Plaintiff Case has No record Of Transcripts  
to Support the Rooker -Feldman doctrine.  
And is NOT Criminal , And can not be Supported.

(2)

C) Plaintiff Case has NO Criminal docket Number or Sub-Section Code of Criminal Law Applies to Plaintiff Case, base on the facts At hand the U.S. Court Should Reconsider the R&R. AND Grant Plaintiff relief base on there is NO transcripts in Plaintiff PA, Case.

D) Plaintiff States this holding is not Consistent with decisions of the Third Circuit of Appeals as Setforth in the Case doctrine of Parkview Associates Partnership V. City of Lebanon, 225 F.3d 321 3d Cir., 2000, Cert. denied, 535 U.S. 1055 (2002)

2) Plaintiff motion the Court to Reconsider As to the requirement of the U.S. Court who may decide only cases in, which An actual Conflict between person exists. which is the Constitutional doctrine that Applies in this Case 04-3696 whenever the U.S. and a state or local government enact Conflicting laws on the same subject as the court R&R Support. Under this Constitutional doctrine the U.S. Court federal law Prevails.

(3)

- A) The Court R&R does not support the body of law as to public law that body of law directly concerned with public Rights and obligations, such as Constitutional, Administrative, Criminal, and international law.
- B) The Court R&R supports the Judicial review as seeking the power of the U.S. Supreme Court to declare unconstitutional an act of Congress a order, or a state law. which was summarized by the U.S. Supreme Court as doctrine of the Rooker-Feldman doctrine.
- C) This Court should review this doctrine as being voiced by the Court as to the following: Exxon Mobil Corp. et al. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp. 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005) by un state Court losers.

(4)

- 3) The granting of the various powers of government in its jurisdiction among its three branches so that each branch checks the other two as in support of the Court R&R on its Rooker-Feldman doctrine.
- 4) The Court R&R support the appellate Court that reviews decisions of Prior Court for substantive and procedural correctness. As to jurisdiction of the U.S. District Court of trials the power of a court to decide a controversy and to award appropriate relief.
- 5) motion of subject matter jurisdiction of the U.S. Court. As to Plaintiff Casey Harris case which is a civil case a court can hear. The Court R&R also support a base of jurisdiction in federal courts requiring that Plaintiff and defendants be involved in an actual controversy that they be citizens of different states in seeking Plaintiff sought relief.

6.) The Plaintiff motion the Court of a Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) The U.S. Court Consider alternatives to litigation, such as negotiation, mediation and arbitration whenever possible, methods of resolving disputes through means other than the Traditional Judicial Process As Supported by the Courts R & R. See, McKnight v. Baker, 343 F. Supp. 2d 422 (E.D.Pa. (2004))

7.) Plaintiff motion the Court to include treating the Law as a Vibrant and Active Source of Rule when faced with New issues. Social as to Custody Such Courts are likely to see the Constitution as a flexible document, and Stare decisis as challengeable when they believe important Social needs must be addressed. The Court R & R does not Address the opinion of the Plaintiff Case As being a Social issue its Unlawful as to his Civil Rights Claims.

8) Conclusion

Question about Administrative Agency's Plaintiff is seeking to asking the court authorized statement of a federal or state government agency established to perform a specific function as to Enforcement of garnishment of a debt. In its Support Enforcement.

Plaintiff States that the Court R&R does not Support Plaintiff Suit of being Civil matter, but A doctrine of a criminal matter in which the defendants doctrine supports.

Plaintiff motion the court that his Civil Case of Enforcement of Support does not have Court Transcripts and as any Criminal docket Number to Support the court R&R. under Rooker Feldman doctrine.

Plaintiff case is not Similar to Plaintiff Civil Claims base on there is No-Criminal Sub-Section Code of Law. that will Apply here in this Civil Case the Court Shoulz reconsider there R&R and Grant Plaintiff Claims for Relief Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477, 114 S.Ct. 2364, 129 L.Ed.2d 383 (1994)

Corr. Haney  
10/06/06

(7)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE:

The undersigned hereby certifies that on 10/06/06, A COPY of the Within motion of Objection to the Court Recommendation was Send on all Counsel of Record by U.S. mail Service. And hand-deliver to the U.S. Clerk of Court by Plaintiff.

Corey Harris  
Corey Harris PROSE  
10/06/06

CC: Matthew J. McLaughlin  
A. Taylor Williams